

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-57 are pending in this application.

Applicant has proposed to amend claim 1. The proposed changes to claim 1 do not introduce any new matter.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 9, 19, 20, 28-30, 34, 42-47, 51, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Wiegley* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,711,677 B1). As will be explained below, the *Wiegley* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 28, and 51, as proposed herein.

Applicant has proposed herein to amend claim 1 to recite positively that the claimed print system includes a content server, a plurality of printers connectable to the content server via a network, and a client computer connectable to the content server via the network. In contrast with the print system defined in claim 1, the print system shown in the *Wiegley* reference includes only two machines, namely a computer 12 and a printer 10. Thus, the *Wiegley* reference does not disclose a content server as in the claimed print system. In response to the Examiner's assertion that computer 12 can be regarded as the content server, Applicant notes that if computer 12 is considered to be the content server, then there would be no client computer in the print system of *Wiegley*. Furthermore, claim 1 specifies that the client computer is connectable to the content server via the network, but no such connection is disclosed in the *Wiegley* reference. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the *Wiegley* reference does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1, as proposed herein.

Regarding claim 9, the Examiner alleges that, if the session identifier matches up with the stored session identifier of the printer, the print job is decrypted and processed in the print system of the *Wiegley* reference. Applicant concurs with the Examiner on this point, but notes that this means that the printer does not have the print permission requester, the print permission transmitter, and the permitted print executor specified in claim 9.

Regarding independent claims 28 and 51, these claims define features of a printer and a content server, respectively, suitable for use in the print system defined in claim 1. As discussed above regarding claim 1, the *Wiegley* reference does not disclose a content server as in the claimed subject matter. In the absence of a content server, it necessarily follows that the printer shown in the *Wiegley* reference does not have the features specified in claim 28.

In view of the foregoing, independent claims 1, 28, and 51, as proposed herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Wiegley*. Claims 2, 3, 9, 19, and 20, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, claims 29, 30, 34, and 42-47, each of which ultimately depends from claim 28, and claim 57, which depends from claim 51, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Wiegley* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 4-8, 10-18, 21-27, 31-33, 35-41, 48-50, and 52-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wiegley* in view of *Venkatesan et al.* (U.S. Patent No. US 6,801,999 B1). Each of claims 4-8, 10-18, and 21-27 ultimately depends from independent claim 1, each of claims 31-33, 35-41, and 48-50 ultimately depends from independent claim 28, and each of claims 52-56 ultimately depends from independent claim 51. The *Venkatesan et al.* reference does not cure the above-mentioned deficiencies of the *Wiegley* reference relative to independent claims 1, 28, and 51, as proposed herein. As such, the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Venkatesan et al.* would not have suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art the subject matter defined in independent claims 1, 28, and 51. Accordingly, claims 4-8, 10-18, 21-27, 31-33, 35-41, 48-50, and 52-56 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Wiegley* in view of *Venkatesan et al.* for at least the reason that they depend from one of independent claims 1, 28, and 51.

**Application No. 09/938,516**  
**Proposed Amendment dated August 16, 2005**  
**Response to Final Office Action mailed May 16, 2005**

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments to claim 1 proposed herein.

The proposed amendments respond to the Examiner's characterization of the *Wiegley* reference relative to the claimed subject matter set forth in the Final Office Action. As such, the proposed amendments to claim 1, which do not require any additional search, could not have been earlier presented. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(c) and should be entered.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-57, as proposed herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. KYWAP007).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP



Peter B. Martine  
Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
(408) 749-6900  
**Customer Number 25920**